

Remarks:

The Applicant wished to thank the Examiner for pointing out various inconsistencies in the Drawings, Specification and Claims. With this amendment, the applicant has attempted to make complete corrections, where necessary.

In relation to the Drawings and 37 CFR 1.83(a), the Rule does state that conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labelled representation. Thus the word "should" implies a non-essential requirement for such conventional features. The Applicant respectfully submits that the rounded corners of claim 4 are such conventional features and cannot in any case be represented in the Drawings owing to the fact that none of the Drawings show the deck viewed directly from above as required by claim 4. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Replacement drawings are submitted herewith that correct the other identified problems. Namely, In Figure 1 the line to reference numeral 10 has been changed to a broken line. In Figures 5 and 6 a horizontal line to the support 4 has been added to show schematically adjustment means as in claims 15 and 16. In Figure 7, the reference numeral 10 has been amended to 100. In Figure 12, reference numerals 10 and 11 have been removed. In Figures 14 and 15, reference numeral 7 has been removed. The drawings are now in proper form and should be accepted.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The amendments made to the claims have dealt with this rejection. Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 USC § 112 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### Double Patenting

Applicant notes the helpful comparison with US7,331,762 and respectfully submits that the claims as now amended are limited in such a way that there is no further basis for a rejection under this ground. Applicant requests that the rejection of the claims on the basis of obviousness double patenting be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The Examiner bases all obviousness rejections upon the combination of Richard (which the Examiner has excusably misinterpreted as having two inventors "John Richard" and "Carew Armstrong" whereas there is only one inventor "John Richard Carew Armstrong", but will be referred to as "Richard" to avoid confusion) and Carstens with the possibility of adding further citations to that base combination.

According to the MPEP, it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

In Richard at page 1, from the third and fourth paragraphs and the second full paragraph on page 2 it is clear that floating platforms and cantilevered structures for supporting turbines are to be ignored. Thus, Richard clearly teaches against the use of a floating platform such as that disclosed in Carstens. As a result, the combination of those two documents is improper and an obviousness objection cannot be maintained. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims on the basis of obviousness.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. James Richardson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

A. James Richardson  
Reg. No. 26,983

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
CUSTOMER NO. 27879  
Telephone: (317) 636-0886  
Fax: (317) 634-6701